

The Cadiz Democratic Sentinel.

VOLUME 27, NO 20.

CADIZ, OHIO, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER, 12, 1860.

TERMS—\$2.00

Union Fair.

The Stillwater Industrial Association Will hold their First Annual Exhibition on Tuesday and Wednesday, the 25th and 26th days of September, 1860.

PREMIUM LIST.

For the best display of Garden Vegetables—first premium \$2.00, 2d pr \$1. Awarding Committee—John C. Phipps, Henry K. Smith and Jacob Green.

CROPS.
For the best crop of Corn, not less than 1 acre nor less than 65 bushels per acre—first premium \$4.00, 2d pr \$2. For the best crop of Wheat not less than 1 acre—first pr \$4.00, 2d pr \$2. For the best crop of Oats not less than 1 acre—first pr \$3.00, 2d pr \$1.50. For the best crop of Hay not less than 1 acre—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. For the best crop of Timothy Seed not less than 1 acre—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. For the best crop of Clover Seed not less than 1 acre—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. For the best crop of Potatoes not less than 1 acre—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1. For the best crop of Sweet Potatoes not less than 1 acre—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00.

Committee—Arrison Shotwell, Jos. P. Wherry and A. S. Karr.

HORSES.
Stallions four years old and upwards, for draft—first pr \$3.00, 2d pr \$2.00. Stallions four years old and upwards, for saddle and harness—first pr \$4.00, 2d pr \$2.00. Stallions three years old for all purposes—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Stallions two years old for all purposes—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Stallions one year old for all purposes—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Committee—Wm. McDonough, Jno. Green, Andrew Richards.

Best spring colt—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Best Mare with spring colt by her side—first pr \$3.00, 2d pr \$2.00. Best Mare four years old and upwards—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Best three year old Mare—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Best Mare two years old for all purposes—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Best Mare one year old—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Committee—Samuel Richey, John Moore, Sen., Thomas Whittington.

Best Gelding five years old and upwards—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Best Gelding from three to four years old for all purposes—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Best Gelding two years old—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Best Gelding one year old—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Committee—Ira Cromley, R. A. Moore, John Greenfield.

Committee—Harvey Baker, David A. Branson, Thomas Barrett. The fastest walking Horse or Mare—first pr \$4.00, 2d pr \$2.00. The fastest racking Horse or Mare—first pr \$3.00, 2d pr \$2.00. The fastest trotting Horse or Mare—first pr \$4.00, 2d pr \$2.00. Committee—James Hutchinson, Jos. Morris, George Latham.

CATTLE.
Best Bull three years old and upwards—first pr \$3.00, 2d pr \$2.00. Best Bull two years old—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Best Bull one year old—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Best Cow calf—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Best Spring calf—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Best Cow three years old and upwards—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Best Heifer under three and over one year old—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Best yoke of Oxen—first pr \$3.00, 2d pr \$2.00. Committee—Samuel Green, Alexander McCormick, William Moore.

JACKS AND MULES.
Jacks—first pr \$3.00, 2d pr \$2.00. Mules three years old and upwards—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Mules two years old—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Mules one year old—first pr 75c, 2d pr 50c. Mules, spring colts—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Committee—David McFadden, John Hollingsworth, John McCormick.

SHEEP—SPANISH MERINOS.
Bucks over two years old—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Bucks one year old—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Buck lambs—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Pen of five ewes over two years old—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Pen of five ewes over one year old—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Pen of five lambs—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Committee—John Dunbar, Jas. Glen, John Moore, P. R.

SILICIAN SHEEP.
Best Mutton Sheep of any kind—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Committee—William Oglevee, John Stewart, Jr., Wm. Russell.

SWEETSTAKE PREMIUM SHEEP.
Bucks of any breed over two years old—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Pen of five ewes of any breed over two years old—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Pen of three buck lambs of any breed—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Committee—Walter Brock, Samuel Wilkins, Amzi McNamee.

HOGS.
Boars—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 75c.

Breeding Sows, litter of pigs with them on exhibition—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 75c. Committee—James Shaw, John Kerby, James Harvey.

CHICKENS—ALL SORTS.
First pr \$30c, 2d pr 25c, 3d pr 10c. Committee—John Price, Sen., Hol-lowell Reeves, Isaac Vickers.

MECHANIC ARTS.
Two-horse Carriages and Buggies—first pr \$3.00, 2d pr \$2.00. Two-horse Wagons—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00.

Threshing Machines—first pr \$3.00, 2d pr \$2.00. Committee—Isaac Curtis, Abner Carver, David Bauster.

Plows—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Corn Cultivators—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Horse Rakes—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Blacksmiths work—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Reapers and Mowers combined—one pr \$2.00.

Single Mower—first pr \$1.50. Corn Plows—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Committee—Benjamin Wood, James Lawrence, Wm. L. Buchanan.

BOOTS.
First pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Shoes—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Harness, double or single—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Saddles—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Leather, best lot of any kind—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c.

Committee—Andrew S. Steel, Carver G. Kennedy, David Duzons.

Cooper ware—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Turners work—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Bureaus—first pr \$2.00, 2d pr \$1.00. Chairs—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Bedsteads—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Sofas—first pr \$1.00.

Committee—Edward Carpenter, Richard Barnes, Levi Greenfield. Best specimen of Painters work—one pr \$1.00.

Best set of Teeth—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Committee—Dr. W. M. Carver, Jno. H. Unstot, Dr. Fleming.

BREAD, HONEY AND DAIRY PRODUCTS.
Best loaf of Bread—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Best sample fresh butter, 2 lbs. or over—first pr 50c, 2d pr 25c. Best box of Honey—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c.

Best cheese, 10 lbs. or over—50c. Best Light Cakes—50c. Best pound Cakes—50c. Best sponge Cake—50c.

Committee—Mrs. B. J. Pamphrey, Catharine McCoy, Sophia Green, Mrs. Sam. Hughes, Wm. C. Wilson.

FRUIT.
Best sample of Fruit, 4 varieties—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Best display in variety, not less than 10 varieties, not less than five apples of each variety—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Best half bushel of Apples of any variety—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c, 3d pr 10c.

Best sample of Apples kept over year—one pr 50c. Best peck of Peaches—first pr 25c, 2d pr 10c. Best peck of Pears—first pr 25c, 2d pr 10c. Best peck of Quinces—first pr 25c, 2d pr 10c. Best specimen of Plums—one pr 25c. Best specimen of Grapes—one pr 25c. Best peck of Dried Apples—one pr 25c. Best peck of dried Peaches, peared—one pr 50c. Best peck of dried Peaches, unpeared—one pr 25c. Committee—Wm. Ramsey, Jno. Price, Isaac Vickers.

SAMPLE OF CROPS.
Best half bushel of Wheat—pr 50c. Best dozen ears of Corn—pr 50c. Best half peck of Timothy seed—25c. Best half peck of Clover seed—50c. Best half bushel of Potatoes of any variety—50c. Best specimen of Broomcorn—25c. Best peck of Onions—20c. Best peck of Tomatoes—20c. Best half-dozen heads of Cabbage—20c. Best specimen of Pumpkins—20c.

Committee—Samuel Colvin, B. J. Pamphrey, R. A. Latham. Preserves and Jellies—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c, and will be awarded on every variety, and includes Pickles and every variety of sealed fruits.

Committee—Mrs. A. Shotwell, Mrs. Samuel Clark, Mrs. J. Woodford, Mrs. Ross Greenfield, Dr. J. W. Wherry.

RED CLOTHES.
Best quilt—first pr \$3.00, 2d pr \$2.00, 3d pr \$1.00. Best Counterpane—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Best specimen Needle work—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Best Shirt—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Best pair woolen Stockings—first pr 25c, 2d pr 10c. Best half pound sewing thread—first pr 50c, 2d pr 25c. Best pair Mittens—first pr 25c, 2d pr 10c. Best pair Blankets—first pr \$50c, 2d pr 25c. Best Rag Carpet—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Best girthing Carpet—first pr \$1.00, 2d pr 50c. Committee—Mrs. James Price, Mrs. Harrison Romans, Mrs. John Hutchinson, Harrison Romans.

Committee on unenumerated articles presented by females—Mrs. Geo. Caves, Mrs. Wm. C. Wilson, Mrs. Jos. Morris, Thomas Hopkins.

Committee on unenumerated articles, males—Elias Gregg, Wm. Wallace, Henry Cecil.

FEMALE EQUESTRIANISM.
Committee—Jeremiah Woodford, Dr. James Sloan, Jonathan Dick.

The premiums on unenumerated articles will be awarded as near as may be in proportion to the foregoing schedule. The Board of Managers do not design paying out premiums, the aggregate of which will exceed the amount realized from the exhibition; but will be governed in the distribution by the foregoing Premium List proportionately, whether up or down. E. CARVER, Pres't.

R. K. PRICE, Sec'y.

Mr. Pugh and Senator Douglas in 1856.

Protection of Property in Territories by Congress.

On the 8th of July, 1856, the Senate of the United States by a vote of 30 to 13, passed "an act (commonly known as the 'Tomb' bill), to authorize the people of the Territory of Kansas to form a constitution and State government, and to come into the Union on an equal footing with the original States." This act was voted for by Judge Douglas, and one of its sections repealed the odious test-oath laws which had been enacted by the Legislature of Kansas. The repeal was an act of interposition by Congress, and in the language of Judge Douglas' report at the time, it "sweep" the territorial test laws "out of existence." Immediately previous to the passage of this act, the Black Republican Senators from Vermont and New Hampshire, complained that no provision was made whereby the persons a property of the Free State men who had been driven from the Territory, should thereafter be protected. To this allegation, Senator Pugh of Ohio, responded as follows:—

"Mr. PUGH: It was suggested by the Senator from Vermont, and reiterated by the Senator from New Hampshire, that there was no provision in the amendment reported by the committee, to protect the persons who have been driven, as they say, out of the Territory by violence, after their return, if they think it sufficient, by covered; but I invite those Senators, or any of their colleagues, to propose any amendment which will more effectively PROTECT persons and PROPERTY in the Territories, and especially the persons who have been driven out, and I will vote for it. I am sure, as I have no doubt a majority of those who support the act of the committee will do.—Congressional Globe, page 1574."

Thus it will be seen, that in the judgment of Senator Pugh, the amendment already reported by Judge Douglas from the committee of which he was chairman, afforded the protection which was asked. But inasmuch as a difference of opinion existed on this point, he (Senator Pugh), invited Republican Senators to propose some additional amendment which would "more effectively protect persons and property in the Territory," and his own vote and that of a majority of the friends of the bill, would be given in its support. This was Congressional interposition for the protection of the property of Free State men. QUERY: Is it the right or duty of Congress to grant its protection to the property of emigrants from one section of the Union and to withhold it from another?—Newark Advocate.

Hon. John Bell on Disunion.

Mr. Douglas and his "rule or ruin" adherents, plead their great love for the Union as a justification of the preference they give to Bell over Breckinridge. They don't dare assert that Breckinridge is himself in favor of Disunion, but they claim that each of his supporters hold disunion sentiments. As these ultra Douglas men seek to cover their conduct by this empty pretence, it may be well to call to remembrance the recorded sentiments held by Mr. Bell.

With this view, we copy the following paragraph from his elaborate speech in the U. S. Senate in July, 1858:—

"Sir, no man who loves his country, no man who has any just pride in the reflection that he is an American citizen, but must decide that these discussions should cease. For, sir, it is not a mere question whether we shall preserve the Union; for that may be, and yet prove no great boon either to ourselves or posterity. The question is not whether the States shall continue united according to the letter of the compact, but by which they are bound together. It is, whether they shall continue to be practically and efficiently co-operative in carrying out the great ends of the association. The question whether mutual trust and confidence shall continue to animate and encourage mutual efforts in promoting the common good, or whether mutual hatred and distrust shall step in to check all progress; to distract and confound all joint endeavors for the common welfare; in fine, to entail upon the country all the evils of endless discord. That is the question, and when you present that issue to me, I say give separation; give me disunion; give me nothing in preference to a union sustained only by power, by constitutional and legal, without respect, trust and confidence. If our future career is to be one of eternal discord, or angry crimination and recrimination, give me rather separation with all its consequences. If I am to be at peace, let it be peace in reality; and if I am to be at war, let me know it at once, that I may put my house in order and be ready to meet the consequences."

The above is plain and unmistakable. The wildest disunionist in the whole South does not wish to go out of the Union if they are left unmolested by the North. How much better is the position of Mr. Bell?

The Good Old Days of Andrew Jackson.

If any of our readers desire to know what was thought of Squatter Sovereignty in the good old days of Andrew Jackson, they can gratify their wishes by reference to the Florida article copied into to-day's paper from the Washington Constitution. It will be seen that in the year 1834, the Territory of Florida, imagining itself at liberty to impose a higher tax on slaves owned by non-residents than on those whose masters lived in the Territory, passed a law to that effect. This was one of those "discriminating" acts of municipal legislation by which Judge Douglas says a Territory may legally exclude slavery.

What was thought of such a law during the glorious days of Old Hickory, when real giants filled the high places in the national councils, may be judged by the fact that Congress passed an act repealing the Florida law and that Andrew Jackson approved and signed it. This affords satisfactory evidence of what the Sage of the Hermitage would have thought of the Territorial Sovereignty bosh which Stephen A. Douglas has been striving to stuff down the throats of intelligent men as the true theory of our government. With some, the opinion of Andrew Jackson may be thought entitled to limited respect. This will undoubtedly be the judgment of men who have but recently abandoned the ranks of his enemies. But not so with those who lived in the good old party. From all such as these, the mature and patriotic judgment, of Andrew Jackson may well command a higher degree of confidence and respect than all the electrifying speeches made by a thousand demagogues seeking popular applause.—Newark Advocate.

From the Washington Constitution.

The Power of Congress to Protect Property in the Territories.

Congressional interposition for the protection of property in the Territories is not a new idea now advocated for the first time by the South and the friends of Mr. Breckinridge. The territorial legislature of Florida had passed laws imposing an unjust and discriminating tax upon slaves owned in that territory by non-residents. Several citizens of Virginia, injured by these laws, presented a petition to the Congress of the United States for relief.—That memorial was referred to the Committee on Territories, and on the 11th of February, 1834, that committee made the following report, which we commend to the calm and dispassionate consideration of every advocate of the doctrine of popular sovereignty in the Territories:—

"The memorialists allege that they are the owners of a number of slaves, removed several years ago from Virginia to the Territory of Florida; that the Legislature of said Territory has imposed a tax of ten dollars a head on all the slaves of non-residents which shall be hired out without reference to the amount for which said slave may have been hired; that an *ex post facto* operation was given to this enactment by applying it to slaves hired out several years before the passage of the law, and that the same or perhaps another law, subjects any non-resident's slaves that may be sold in the Territory to a further tax of fifteen dollars each. They therefore ask Congress for relief.

"The committee are satisfied that the memorialists are entitled to relief. It is certainly a principle of the policy of the United States, as well as the dictates of common justice to allow any territorial legislature to tax property of non-residents higher than the property of resident citizens.

"The committee think Congress should always protect the property of the citizens of the United States when subjected to the operation of unjust legislation by the Territorial Government. In the case above referred to, that principle is asserted and maintained in practice. The same principle requires the same practice now. And for that purpose the committee herewith report a bill."

The bill so reported was enacted into a law by Congress, and was approved by President Jackson on the 30th of June, 1834. The law is as follows:—

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That all such acts or parts of acts passed by the Legislative Council of the Territory of Florida as may impose a higher or greater tax on the slaves or other property of non-resident citizens than is imposed on the slaves or other property of resident citizens, be and the same are hereby repealed and declared null and void."

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, That if any person shall attempt to enforce any of the acts or parts of acts passed by the legislative council of the Territory of Florida, as aforesaid by demanding or receiving any tax, imposition or assessment, authorized or prescribed thereby, such person shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by fine not exceeding two hundred dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or by either or both of said punishments."

When this law was under discussion in the House of Representatives, not a single voice was raised in favor of the Territorial laws, or denying the power, the right, and the duty of Congress to repeal them, for the purpose of protecting the property of citizens in the Territories. The doctrine that the people of the Territory, acting through their Territorial Legislature, had the power to pass such laws by virtue of inherent sovereignty was not then thought of. On the contrary, every member of the House who participated in the debate, Mr. Williams, Mr. White, and Mr. Fillmore, all concurred in denouncing these territorial laws as unjust, objectionable, and as passed without right. They, in so many words, the legislative council had no right to pass such a law. Congress did not hesitate to repeal the obnoxious enactments and in repealing imposed a penalty of fine and imprisonment upon any one who should attempt to carry out the repealed laws. They treated the acts of the territorial legislature with no more consideration, and regarded them as entitled to no higher respect than the ordinances of a municipal corporation. For what purpose was this done? Clearly to protect the property of the citizens in the Territories against the unjust and unfriendly legislation of the people of the Territory. The principle asserted by those who advocated, enacted and approved this law, is the entire subordination of territorial laws to the power and authority of Congress acting within its territorial limits. A State legislature, in the absence of constitutional prohibition in the State constitution, may discriminate between different kinds of property and fix the tax to be paid by each, it may exempt certain kinds of property from all taxation, and oblige other kinds to pay an increased tax.—But this cannot be done by a territorial legislature because the people of a territory are not sovereign; because a Territory is in a state of pupillage, is subject to the General Government and is especially under the supervision of Congress.

But this law establishes as a fact that a democratic Congress intervened for the purpose of protecting property in a Territory against the unfriendly legislation of the people of the Territory, and that intervention was approved by Andrew Jackson. The report of the above cited, which in 1834 met the unanimous approval of the democratic President and the democratic party in Congress, asserts the same principles which are recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States, by the resolutions of the Senate, and by a majority of the States at Charleston and adopted by the Convention at Baltimore which nominated Mr. Breckinridge for President, viz:—

"First. That the government of a Territory organized by an act of Congress, is provisional and temporary, and during its existence all citizens of the United States have an equal right to settle with their property in the Territory, without their rights, either of person or property, being destroyed or injured by Congressional or Territorial legislation.

"Second. That it is the duty of the Federal Government in all its departments to protect the rights of persons and property in the Territories, and wherever else its constitutional authority extends."

The principle so asserted, adopted and approved by the Jacksonian democracy in 1834 is utterly at variance with that other doctrine that the people of a Territory, during its territorial existence, have the right and may lawfully exclude or effectually prevent the introduction of slave property into the Territory by unfriendly legislation enacted by the territorial legislature, and when such legislation has been passed, that Congress has no power to intervene for the purpose of protection, because of a qualified or absolute sovereignty in the people of the Territory.

Sprinkling the Side Walks with the Blood of Foreigners.

In his speech at Knoxville, Tennessee, in September, 1856, Hon. John Bell (whom Douglas is aiding against Breckinridge) spoke as follows:—

"The fears of the timid have been appealed to, by the assaults of the American party, and their co-operation invoked in putting it down, on the alleged ground that its policy, in regard to foreigners, tends to provoke riot and bloodshed. It is said that this new party has been stained with blood, in its very birth, and that from this we may augur a bloody future. Yes, blood has been shed, and it may be shed again; but I will not stop to inquire who provoked the shedding of blood in Louisville after; or that the highways and open fields of our country should drink up the blood of its citizens slain in deadly conflict between armed bands—may be between disciplined legions—Americans on the one side, and foreigners, supported by native fanatics, on the other. And this will be our future, unless now, and before it is too late, we erect sufficient barriers to arrest the torrent of aliens and strangers, which threatens in a few years more to flood the whole land."

Arkansas all over for Breckinridge and Lane.

The success of the Democracy in Arkansas is complete. Rust, who was the Douglas candidate for United States Senator, has not a single Douglas member of the Legislature to back his aspirations. The Senators and Representatives elected, show a very large Democratic majority for Breckinridge and Lane. The Governor and the Congressmen elected by large majorities are National Democrats. The only contest between the candidates for Governor was to show which was the warmest for Breckinridge and Lane, and the people decided that Rust was, and elected him by a large majority. It is said on good authority, that so strong was the anti-Douglas feeling, that not a single Douglas man was elected even to a county office in the State, and the general belief is, that there are not enough left in the State to form an electoral college.

It will be remembered that Arkansas is one of the States Douglas was sure to carry. He has carried it to some purpose.

Those Who Have Used It.

Among the many testimonials in favor of the effects of Dr. H. C. B. Bitters, we offer the names of the following, many of whom are well known in this city:—

James Colvin, of St. Louis, says: "It cured me of Dyspepsia."

Captain Henry Eaton says: "It cured my wife of Nephritis."

THE DOCTRINES AND POLICY OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

As given by its Recognized Leaders, Orators, Presses, and Platforms.

"Out of thine own Mouth will I Condemn Thee."

(CONTINUED.)

Is this what the Republicans refer to by their parrot cry of "bleeding Kansas?"

But read the following disgraceful confession which appeared in the New York Times (a Republican sheet.) It fully shows that the system of outrage and violence was purposely kept alive in Kansas during the campaign of 1856, with a view to inflame the popular mind of the North against the South, and thus promote Fremont's election:—

LAWRENCE, KANSAS, Monday, July 21, '56. "Companies of dragoons are stationed at Le-compton, Blanton, Palmyra, and Cedar Creek. In their immediate neighborhood, and generally throughout the Territory, affairs appear quiet and peaceful. This appearance, however, is deceptive. The same feelings—the same desire to fight—exists now as did exist before the appearance of the dragoons. Travelers here and there are stopped and robbed, and cabins where arms are secreted and men stationed to assault and rifle at their arms and ammunition. These attacks had been made by the Free-State party, conducted in a more quiet and orderly manner than heretofore. When done, it is done so that no bogus sheriff, backed by the United States dragoons, knows upon whom to put his finger. Within a few days arms and ammunition have been taken from different places where they had been stored by the pro-slavery regulators, and expeditions are now on foot looking to further captures! We are frequently in receipt of runners from different parts of the Territory, giving account of the equipments of armed men. Enough daily happens to keep alive the excitement and give beautiful encouragement to the war spirit."

This writer lets out the whole secret of the Republican campaign of 1856. It was war in Kansas, and agitation at the North. His operations in the line of bloodshed and robbery looked solely to Fremont's election. John Brown appears to have been controlled by a cordial love for such "Kansas work"—to use his own expressive phrase—while many of their associates were controlled by both these motives. The sagacity of the people detected this foul conspiracy, and by the Presidential election of 1856 the Republican party was found to be in a minority, in the popular vote of the Union, by the instrumentality of not less than 1,349,000 votes! It has lost instead of gaining strength since then; but by the divisions of the conservative masses opposed to them, this party, which is now in a minority of more than a million of the popular vote of the Union, dares to hope and contend for an administration of the government upon its own sectional, unconstitutional, and infamous basis. It aims to work wrong, injustice, and insult to our southern brethren of a minority government.

At December term 1856, the United States Supreme Court gave its decision in the celebrated Dred Scott case. The case had been begun in Missouri in 1853, was appealed to the Supreme Court, and the judgment there appeared in the spring of 1857. With unusual unanimity the Court ruled that a negro was not a citizen of the United States, and that neither by Congress or by a Territorial legislature (the creature of Congress) could the right of property in slaves held in a Territory be impaired and destroyed. This decision was a death-blow to the doctrine of negro equality and the Wilmot proviso, which were the corner stones of the Republican faith. Forthwith their presses all over the land teemed with the foulest abuse of the court, and contempt for its authority. The judges who, up to that hour, had been revered by every pool citizen, and respected even by the bad, were reviled as tools of the "slave power," their personal characters assailed, and the members of the court declared to be in their dotage. The Tribune, which is read more than any other Republican organ, declared that their judgment was not entitled to any more "moral weight than the judgment of a majority of those congregated in any Washington bar-room."

Mr. Seward charged directly collision and corrupt connivance on the court, in his speech in the Senate on 31 March. Hear him.

"The much debated had been heard in the chamber of the court in the basement of the Capitol, in the presence of the curious visitors at the seat of Government, when the dullness of a judicial investigation, could not disgust. The court did not hesitate to please the incoming President by seizing this extraneous and idle forensic discussion, and converting it into an occasion for pronouncing an opinion that the Missouri prohibition was void, and that by force of the Constitution, slavery existed, with all the elements of popular sovereignty over man, in all the Territories of the United States, partitioned to any popular sovereignty within the Territories, and even to the authority of Congress itself!"

"The day of inauguration came—the first one among all the celebrations of that great national festival that was to be decreed by a section between the Executive and Judicial departments, to undermine the national legislation and the liber of the people."

Well might Senator Benjamin ask, "Is there not a word of truth in this? Not one! Is a solitary fact alleged? Not one; but a broad and naked charge is made, which is intended to stamp infamy upon characters hitherto beyond the breath of reproach. Shame, shame upon the Senator that makes such charges as these, and has no proof to support them."

Further on, in the same speech, Mr. Seward boldly threatens an attempt to re-organize the Supreme Court so as to make it conform to the will of the Republican party. He says:—

"The Supreme Court also can reverse its spurious judgment more easily than we can reconcile the people to its usurpation. 'The people of the United States never can, and they never will, accept principles so unconstitutional and so abhorrent. Never, never. Let the court recede. Whether it recedes or not, we shall re-organize the Court, and thus reform its political sentiments and practices, and bring them into harmony with the Constitution and the laws of nature.'"

Following up the same strain, Mr. Abraham Lincoln says: "The people of the United States are the rightful masters of both Congress and the courts; not the lawmakers, but the law-abiding and honest men, women, and children at the North were suffering last winter for bread."

bound by their oaths to look only to the law and the facts.

Mr. Abbott, a Republican member of the House, said:—

"Hence, the opinions of the court therein expressed are not only false, but they are also judicial usurpations entitled to no more respect than the opinions of any other equal number of political demagogues and similar moral with themselves."

The address of the Republican Convention, of New York, October, 1857, says:—

"It is one of the lamentable features of the present Democratic degeneracy, that it has invaded even the sanctuary of justice, and from the seat once honored by Jay, Rutledge, Ellsworth, and Marshall, now strains the equity through the sieve of sectionalism, in accents as barbarous as they are disgraceful to the nation to which we belong, and the age in which we live. The infamy of the Dred Scott decision is but a less climacteric sequent to the efforts that have been put forth to sectionalize and pervert a tribunal in which was once centered the respect and confidence of the nation."

In October, 1858, we find Mr. Seward, then confessed by all as the leader and master-spirit of the Republicans, laying down, in his Rochester speech, their manifesto of future operations. It contemplates no peace with the South, no re-creation of the sectional strife, nothing but during hostility to southern institutions. He says:—

"These these antagonistic systems are continually coming into closer contact, and collision results. Shall I tell you what this collision means? They who think it is accidental, unnecessary, the work of interested fanatical agitators, and therefore ephemeral, mistake the case altogether. It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States will, sooner or later, become entirely a slaveholding nation, or entirely a free labor nation. Either the cotton and rice fields of South Carolina, and the sugar plantations of Louisiana, will ultimately be free labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become markets for legitimate merchandise alone; or else the rice fields and wheat fields of Massachusetts and New York must again be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture, and to the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more a market for trade in the bodies and souls of men. It is the failure to apprehend this great truth that induces so many successful attempts at final compromise between the slave and free States; and it is the existence of this great fact that renders all such pretended compromise, when made, vain and ephemeral."

The whole country was startled and disgusted at this brutal and bloody manifesto. Conservative men at the North stood aghast at the idea of an unending strife between the North and the South. They held that it was not necessary for either section to force its system upon the other, and they knew that, to attempt it, would compel disunion and civil war. This doctrine of Seward's, however, was not new with him. It may be found shadowed forth in the speeches of Wilson and other Republicans heretofore quoted, and was distinctly avowed anterior to Seward by Mr. Abraham Lincoln the present Republican candidate for the Presidency, in his canvass for the United States Senate. Hear him:—

"In my opinion it (the slavery agitation) will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe the government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate